## Casse 3:12-cv-00944-JSTV Document 375 Filed 08/02/12 Page 11 of 65

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE, RENAKER & J. JEFFREY LEWIS - 066587 jlewis@lewisfeinberg.com BILL LANN LEE - 108452 blee@lewisfeinberg.com ANDREW LAH - 234580 alah@lewisfeinberg.com SACHA CRITTENDEN STEINBERGER - ssteinberger@lewisfeinberg.com 476 9 <sup>th</sup> Street Oakland, CA 94607 Telephone: (510) 839-6824 Facsimile: (510) 839-7839  Attorneys for Plaintiff RETIREE SUPPORT GROUP OF CONTRACOUNTY	253823
10	(See Attached for Additional Counsel)	
11	UNITED STAT	TES DISTRICT COURT
12	FOR THE NORTHERN	N DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13		
14	RETIREE SUPPORT GROUP OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY,	No. CV 12-00944 (JSW)
15	ŕ	STIPULATION EXTENDING TIME FOR
16	Plaintiff,	FILING OF SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT, VOLUNTARY PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND
17	V.	RESETTING OF CASE MANAGEMENT
18	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY,	CONFERENCE;[ <del>PROPOSED]</del> ORDER
19	Defendant.	
20		N.D. Local Rule 6-1(a)
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	STIPULATION, REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION AND [PROPOSE (CASE NO. CV 12-00944 (JSW)	<del>D</del> ORDER

## Casse 3:12-cv-00944-JSTV Document 1375 Filed 08/08/12 Page 220f 65 1 (Additional Counsel) 2 HANSON BRIDGETT LLP RAYMOND F. LYNCH – 119065 3 rlynch@hansonbridgett.com SARAH D. MOTT – 148597 4 smott@hansonbridgett.com JANE FEDDES – 282117 5 ifeddes@hansonbridgett.com 425 Market Street, 26th Floor 6 San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 777-3200 7 Facsimile: (415) 541-9366 8 COUNTY COUNSEL. CONTRA COSTA COUNTY 9 SHARON L. ANDERSON - 94814 sharon.anderson@cc.cccou -nty.us MARY ANN McNETT MASÓN - 115089 10 maryann.mason@cc.cccounty.us 651 Pine St., 9th Floor 11 Martinez, CA 94553 Telephone: (925) 335-1800 12 Facsimile: (925)646-1078 13 Attorneys for Defendant 14 CONTRA COSTA COUNTY 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 STIPULATION, REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER (CASE No. CV 12-00944 (JSW)

Plaintiff Retiree Association of Contra Costa County ("Plaintiff") and Defendant Contra Costa County ("County" or "Defendant") ("the Parties"), by and through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

- 1. On July 10, 2012, the Court issued its Order Granting Motion to Dismiss (Dkt 32), allowing Plaintiff leave to amend its complaint by August 10, 2012. Under the Order, Plaintiff may file a stipulation to extend the deadline if it needs "additional time to discover the ordinances and resolutions upon which its members' claims are predicated." *Id.* at 5.
- 2. On July 13, 2012, the Parties met and conferred regarding the Court's Order. Plaintiff informed the County it intends to file a Second Amended Complaint and that it requires additional time to obtain and review additional documents. The County stated it is not opposed to an extension of time. The Parties discussed possible voluntary production of documents by the County. The Parties agreed to participate in a second meet and confer session after Plaintiff provided the County with a list of requested documents.
- 3. On July 17, 2012, Plaintiff provided the County with its list of requested documents:
  - 1. All Memoranda of Understanding and all resolutions ratifying the MOUs;
  - 2. All resolutions and attachments to the resolutions relating to retiree health benefits;
  - 3. All documents relating to the adoption, interpretation, or implementation of any resolution or MOU regarding retiree health benefits, including but not limited to job announcements and postings, employee handbooks, staff memoranda prepared for the Board, and cost analyses of retiree health care;
  - 4. All board meeting minutes, agenda, and attachments relating to retiree health benefits;
    - 5. All recordings of Board of Supervisor meetings.
- 4. On July 20, 2012, the Parties met and conferred regarding those requests. Plaintiff stated it was requesting documents dating back to January 1, 1970. The County agreed voluntarily to provide extant non-privileged documents responsive to Request Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5 back to January 1970. Relating to Request No. 3, the County also agrees to produce any other non-privileged, public documents that were provided to the Board of Supervisors accompanying

1	the passage of the resolutions relating to the MOUs or retiree health benefits. The Parties
2	disagree as to whether any further production by the County with respect to Request No. 3 is
3	required now. Plaintiff requests a status conference regarding this issue at the Court's earliest
4	convenience and the County will not oppose holding such a conference.
5	5. The Parties wish to cooperate and have generally agreed to the following schedule
6	to produce the agreed upon documents as referenced above, amend the complaint, file a
7	responsive pleading and a subsequent briefing schedule:
8	a. The County will make reasonable good faith efforts to provide documents
9	responsive to Request Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5 within sixty (60) days or September
10	27, 2012;
11	b. Plaintiff will file its amended complaint within sixty (60) days after completion
12	of the County's production or November 30, 2012;
13	c. Because of the holidays and possible furloughs, the County will file its
14	responsive pleading by January 9, 2013;
15	d. If the County files a motion to dismiss, Plaintiff's opposition brief will be filed
16	twenty-five (25) days after the County files the motion; and
17	e. The County's reply brief will be filed eleven (11) days after the filing of
18	Plaintiff's opposition brief.
19	The briefing schedule is identical to that previously ordered by the Court. (See Dkt. 22)
20	7. On July 27, 2012, the Court re-scheduled the Case Management Conference for
21	October 12, 2012. (See Dkt. 34) Lead counsel for the County will be unable to attend on that
22	date because he will be in Europe on a pre-planned family vacation and will not return until
23	October 16, 2012.
24	8. The Parties believe there is good cause and request the Court to re-schedule the
25	Case Management Conference to a date after October 16, 2012. (See Declaration of Raymond F.
26	Lynch, attached hereto and incorporated herein.)
27	
28	////
	- 4 -

STIPULATION, REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER (CASE NO. CV 12-00944 (JSW)

## Casse 3:12-cv-00944-JSW Document 375 Filed 08/08/12 Page 55 of 165

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED between the Parties.
2	DATED: Assess 2 2012
3	DATED: August 2, 2012 LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE, RENAKER & JACKSON, P.C.
4	By:/s/ Jeffrey Lewis
5	Jeffrey Lewis
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff RETIREE SUPPORT GROUP OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
7	
8	DATED: August 2, 2012 HANSON BRIDGETT LLP
10	By:/s/ Raymond F. Lynch
11	Raymond F. Lynch Sarah D. Mott
12	Attorneys for Defendant CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
13	
14	ORDER
15	PURSUANT TO THE FOREGOING STIPULATION:
16	1. Plaintiff is granted additional time to file its amended complaint.
17	2. The schedule set forth by the Parties is acceptable.
18	3. For good cause shown, the Court resets the Case Management Conference to
19	February 1, 2013 at 1:30 p.m.
20	IT IS SO ORDERED.
21	
<ul><li>22</li><li>23</li></ul>	Dated: August 6, 2012
23	HON JETFREY S. WHITE United States Judge
25	
26	
27	
28	

STIPULATION, REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER (CASE NO. CV 12-00944 (JSW)